

Application Serial No.: 10/673,941
Amendment and Response to May 21, 2008 Final Office Action

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 11 and 13 – 24 are in the application. Claims 1, 14, 16, 18, 23, and 24 are currently amended; claims 2 – 11, 13, 15, and 17 remain unchanged from the original versions thereof, claim 12 is canceled; and claims 19 – 22 were previously presented. Claims 1, 18, 23, and 24 are the independent claims herein.

No new matter has been added to the claims as a result of the amendments submitted herewith. Substantial support for the claim amendments to independent claims 1, 18, 23, and 24 is provided by the Specification at paragraph [0022].

Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1 – 4, 6, 7, 10 – 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, and 21 – 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farrar et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,122,671 A (hereinafter, Farrar) in view of Bennett et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,209,950 B2 (hereinafter, Bennett). This rejection is traversed.

Applicant notes that claim 1 is currently amended. Further, claim 1 relates to a method including receiving a request from an application to provide an outgoing message to a destination address, the request including data indicative of a message, the destination address, and an outgoing message type; converting the message to the outgoing message in a format compatible with the outgoing message type, the outgoing message format being a different format than the message; and sending the outgoing message to the destination address. The method further includes providing, in reply to the request, a response to the application indicative of a success of the sending of the outgoing message to the destination address.

Claims 18, 23, and 24 are worded similar to claim 1 with respect to the current rejection thereof under 35 USC 103(a).

Application Serial No.: 10/673,941
Amendment and Response to May 21, 2008 Final Office Action

Thus, it is clear that the independent claims all include receiving a request from an application and providing a reply in response to the request. That is, each of the independent claims follows a request– response model.

With respect to the cited and relied upon Farrar, Applicant notes that Farrar discloses a system and method for receiving and processing satellite messages. In particular, Farrar discloses receiving satellite messages from a mobile user via a satellite network 16 by a land earth station (LES) having addresses identifying the recipient of the satellite message. The LES forwards the received message byte stream plus a header from the satellite network to a customer premise gateway (CPG) 26 at the dispatcher (i.e., the destination in the current example) via a public network. Farrar discloses middleware software that receives the byte stream from the public network, reassemble the satellite message from the received byte stream and present the reassembled message to the CPG. Farrar discloses the CPG application software converts the reassembled message into a format usable by a computer-aided-dispatcher (CAD) 28 resident at the dispatcher 28 and outputs the converted message to the CAD application. .(See Farrar, column 5, lines 31 – 47)

Applicant notes that Farrar fails to disclose or even suggest the claimed aspects of: (1) receiving a request from an application to provide an outgoing message to a destination address, the request including data indicative of a message, the destination address, and an outgoing message type; and (2) providing, in reply to the request, a response to the application indicative of a success of the sending of the outgoing message to the destination address. Farrar fails to disclose the claimed request and corresponding response model interaction, let alone the specifics of the request and the response. Applicant notes that Farrar does not disclose a request to provide an outgoing message in a particular, specified message type. Farrar instead discloses middleware software performing a conversion based on requirements of the receiving dispatcher. That is, there is no indication provided by Farrar that the conversion was implemented in response to a request for the message to be in compliance with a specific outgoing message type.(See Farrar, column 5, line 31 – column 6, line 8)

Application Serial No.: 10/673,941
Amendment and Response to May 21, 2008 Final Office Action

Furthermore, there is no evidence in Farrar of a request to provide an outgoing message that includes data indicative of the outgoing message type. The Farrar disclosed middleware instead converts the message to a format required by the CAD.

Regarding the Office's reliance on Bennett for the claimed aspects of the data indicative of an outgoing message type and a destination address, Applicant notes the example "CELCOS" table 404 depicted in FIGS. 8 and 10 and discussed in the section of Bennett cited and relied upon in the Final Office Action relates to a database routing table. That is, the TypeID and TypeDesc are not included in or part of data received in a request to provide an outgoing message to a destination address. (See Bennett, FIGS. 8, 10 and column 23, line 65 – column 25, line 47) Applicant notes that the cited claim 1 also states that the identifiers are in a "routing database". That is, the Farrar identifiers are not received as part of a request but are instead located in a database.

Additionally, Bennett also fails to disclose the claimed request and corresponding response.

Therefore, it is clear that Farrar and Bennett do not render claims 1, 18, 23, and 24 obvious under 35 USC 103(a). Applicant submits that claims 2 – 4, 6, 7, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, 19, 21, and 22 depend from claims 1, and 18 and are patentable over Farrar and Bennett for at least depending from an allowable base claim. Accordingly, Applicant requests the reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 – 4, 6, 7, 10 – 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, and 21 – 24 under 35 USC 103(a).

Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farrar et al. in view of Bennett et al. and in further view of Oz et al. U.S. Patent No. 7,058,087 B1. This rejection is traversed.

Inasmuch as the rejection of claim 14 depends on the disclosure of Farrar and Bennett as applied to claim 1 above and the disclosure of Farrar and Bennett was proven insufficient under 35 USC 103(a) by Applicant hereinabove, it is respectfully submitted that the alleged combination of Farrar, Brown and Oz is insufficient to support the rejection of claim 14 under 35 USC 103(a). Furthermore, the disclosure of

Application Serial No.: 10/673,941
Amendment and Response to May 21, 2008 Final Office Action

Oz combined with Farrar and Bennett does not overcome the failings/shortcomings of Farrar and Bennett.

Accordingly, Applicant requests the reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 14 under 35 USC 103(a).

Claims 5, 8, 9, 17, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farrar et al. in view of Bennett et al. and in further view of DeCoursey et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,594,706 B1. This rejection is traversed.

Inasmuch as the rejection of claims 5, 8, 9, 17, and 20 depends on the disclosure of Farrar and Bennett as applied to claims 1 and 18 above and the disclosure of Farrar and Bennett was shown to be insufficient under 35 USC 103(a) by Applicant hereinabove, it is respectfully submitted that the alleged combination of Farrar, Brown and DeCoursey is insufficient to support the rejection of claims 5, 8, 9, 17, and 20 under 35 USC 103(a). Furthermore, the disclosure of DeCoursey combined with Farrar and Bennett does not overcome the failings/shortcomings of Farrar and Bennett:

Accordingly, Applicant requests the reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5, 8, 9, 17, and 20 under 35 USC 103(a).

JUL 22 2008


Application Serial No.: 10/673,941
Amendment and Response to May 21, 2008 Final Office Action

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the pending claims. If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of the present application, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned via telephone at (408) 492-5336.

Respectfully submitted,

22 July, 2008
Date


David D. Chung
Registration No. 38,409
(408) 492-5336

SIEMENS CORPORATION
Customer Number: 28524
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830

Attn: Elsa Keller, Legal Department
Telephone: 732-321-3026